Survey: Transportation Demand Management

Question: Should development companies be responsible for managing the transportation demands of new developments?

No, development companies should not be responsible for managing the transportation demands of new developments. : 16

Other (please be specific) : 26

> **Am not sure I get the implications. I want them to have to have responsibility, but when I see what the city has done to create little HOAs and cul de sacs that create dissension and make HOAs responsible for street repairs etc, then I am not sure I understand the implications. Were developers made responsible for Rainlilly in North Boulder? The consequences have made for lousy neighborhood feelings.**
> **I trust our city council more than these surveys. Too complex.**

> **Choosing to focus on "development companies" seems pretty limiting. This implies to me that this is the company that develops/builds the infrastructure. Don't they then walk away and leave future actions to "management companies", homeowner's associations, private owners? This seems like insider ballgame speak to me.**

> **Development companies should be required to make in addition to their huge profit properties small family homes and affordable units based on the income brackets of the commuters to reduce traffic and be required to build multi lane roads to those communities to be approved for the build. The pearl street near the train tracks on the east end of town is a total clusterFCK of traffic navigation and congestion nightmare.**

> **Development companies should minimize automobile parking, work with tenants and the city to provide eco-passes, and ensure that bike access (bike lanes, bicycle connections, and bike parking) as well as pedestrian access (beautiful places to walk, benches, separation between cyclists and pedestrians) are well-designed.**

> **Everyone should have equal access despite of income.**

> **For example with the Google move into boulder and the large condo development on 30th and Pearl St. The impact to our infrastructure will be**

tremendous. The locals already living here will feel the consequences. These issues; traffic, schooling, noise, over use of trails... need to be on the discussion table.

For starters why would you ignore businesses from this question? But the third choice is the most respective answer given. The city has the responsibility to stop growth in the long run if the infrastructure is maxed out like it is.

go away!!!! you guys keep me up all night. I wish you could hear the terrible noise....

http://cogniqxl.org/

I believe that the City should manage transportation planning and then require it be incorporated into any development plan. Rather than allowing the developer to suggest options, the City should state where bike paths/lanes shall be (or bus stops, or car share parking locations) and mandate that each new development comply. The key here is that connectivity and infrastructure will not work if it's on a case-by-case basis. Our paths are already too fragmented.

I find it hard to see how transportation improvements can be tied to individual developments since their scale and timing are so radically different. Is there such thing as a Transportation Investment Fee? Similar to what developers have to pay into the utility system? This might be a way to direct some of the profit into transp. improvements. Most importantly, the site design of large sites should be a factor. More PUBLIC ped. ROWs and true, public service alleys should be required always.

I'm not sure how development companies could be responsible for managing tenants' travel behavior, but they ABSOLUTELY should re responsible for creating an environment that offers transportation options. And this both by building/property design and possibly taxes and fees to support alternative transportation methods.
and fees to provide for

It's a community challenge which should engage the community through the decision-making process. Education and collaboration generally result in more long term success.

Just like water, sewer, etc., developers should have to pay for the increased

transportation costs in the area around projects. Our streets are choking while developers get rich and move on. It sucks.

People are responsible for their own transportation. Stop transferring responsibility to businesses whose main function has nothing to do with transportation. If enough demand exists for public transportation, the industry will respond accordingly. You should not be involved in any way. Fire the bureaucrats who posed this question and lower our tax rate. If we could keep our money instead of being forced to pay you to have bad ideas, we could afford better transportation

Please define transportation demands. The county should be responsble for the design and development of roads and sidewalks and public pathways. Development companies should be required to make proposals that are reviewed by the county. If there is no grand design then it will be a disorganized mess.

regulations regarding parking allotments are already on the books though they may need review, public transportation initiatives/promotions as well.

The city should have strict regulations about want a developer must provide, ie. two underground or garaged parking spaces, bike paths, walkways to buses, etc. and the developer decides how to provide it at their own budget

The fewer the costs are externalized the more level the playing field.

The last option "managing tenants transportation demands and travel behavior" sounds a bit Big Brother-ish, but they need to go beyond creating and environment and options. Development companies need to create incentives, hand-in-hand with government, for tenants to do what is right for the environment and our community.

There should be a balance between city managed transportation and employer managed transportation demands and behavior. I would create areas of the city that are more connected to public transportation and bike paths have a property tax benefit.

This question is a red herring. What does the answer to this survey have to do with the mismanagement of transportation demands by the City? Trying to blame developers for your incompetence is not the way to solve transportation needs.

This seems like a push poll to me. Obviously developments should be constructed in a way that takes a responsible approach to thier traffic impacts. This will and should create additional costs on behalf of the developer. But to place all costs/responsibility on the developer is not equitable. Other will share in the benefits of the development and that could be as clear as the tenants who will occupy the building to as indirect as the corner restuarant who will have more business or the

Transportation demands should be planned on a regional scale.

Why should taxes cover the costs of development? Traffic is terrible in this city. Development should pay its way.

Yes and they ought to pay their utility bills for permits which I understand they sometimes do not.

No, development companies should not be responsible for managing tenants' travel behavior. : 4

Yes, development companies should create an environment that provides transportation options, but should not be responsible for tenants' travel behavior. : 63

Yes, development companies should be responsible for managing tenants' transportation demands and travel behavior. : 27

Question: Comments

(Continued form my answer to other) County who will collect more in property taxes. You might just as well have changed your terminology in this question to call them Big Bad Development Companies. Your language has skewed the results in that direction anyways.

?

Alternative transportation is disjointed and fragmented in Boulder. Case-by-case having a developer prescribe options for this will not solve the problem.

Boulder needs to drastically slow down new development building UNTIL a good plan is in place to deal with all the increase traffic. No Train, No Light

Rail and No BRT but we are developing like we have a major subway station under every building.

City planners in conjunction with regional transportation experts should be responsible for the long term transportation needs posed by new/existing developments.

Companies should provide facilities (bike paths, bus stops) to integrate with existing City transportation systems.

Development companies should create people-oriented spaces rather than auto-oriented spaces that are inherently unfriendly to people on foot or bikes. Higher density developments provide many more useful destinations within pedestrian, bike, and transit range, while low density high parking development essentially requires automobile usage to traverse the large distances between the widely separated buildings and destinations that define low density ("sprawling") development.

http://cogniqxl.org/

I don't understand what you mean by manage tenant's transportation behavior. It sounds draconian but perhaps not.

I doubt that developers can really be held accountable over the long term. A better solution is to unbundle parking from unit ownership so that those who utilize it have to pay.

I have lived here 40 years and have yet to see how growth and development have benefited our lives. A few get rich. The city makes jobs for some. The rest suffer.

I hope we unpaint Folsom

I'd like to see more bike racks required, but you can't force people to ride bicycles. Just make it easier for them.

In the vernacular --- Hell! yes (i.e. Why should they be allowed to pocket the profit and cumber us with the costs?).

Incentives can prod shifts in attitude and behavior. When BVSD offered teachers Eco-Passes, for example, I started using the bus more to go from

South Boulder to Downtown. Developers should include in new construction thoughtful transportation options like creating easy access to bike paths and bike storage on premises. They should work in incentives for tenants to take public transportation.

It would have been helpful to provide more background information on this. It's difficult to tell what this is about.

J/H imbalance needs to be fixed.

See above.
The point of elections is to elect representatives who have expertise and good decision-making abilities, but they really need to look into the future carefully.

Seems like this is trying to make the last few people who move into Boulder pay for all the development. The city needs to take responsibility and pay for improvements as they are needed. The attitude that we can annex narrow strips of land for the tax revenue, but then don't want to pay for the infill is wrong. Everyone pays the same state and federal taxes that fund large portions of highway projects and city taxes should be used for neighborhood improvements.

Summit County has a free, clean, efficient bus system. Could RTD in Boulder be free to users, financed by new development fees?

Taxpayers should not have to pay for profit companies for things that should be provided by government.

terrible noise all night, terrible idea. you are going to cause traffic back ups and are currently causing noise pollution that would get anyone else arrested.... so angry....

Thanks for the opportunity to input

The city is responsible for managing traffic issues. However, Development should bear impact costs.

The City should be responsible for transportation infrastructure used by all citizens. The City collects plenty of fees from developers. Please stop putting the responsibilities of the City government on the back of

development projects. You are simply making them more expensive, which does not improve their quality. Instead of wasting money on other City Council passion projects, focus on the important infrastructure that makes the city work for the citizens and larger Front Range community.

There is so much more developers can and should do. Safe and secure bike parking. Bus passes. Pay the real cost of parking. Access to car share

We need to strongly encourage alternatives to driving.

What is the North Trail Study Area Plan?

Would like to see more Ecopass districts and bike parking required, and a removal of car-parking minimums.

Yes and they ought to pay their utility bills for permits which I understand they sometimes do not. The function should be audited.

Comments

Number of Comments 0